JORGENSEN PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2011
7:01 P.M.

JORGENSEN PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2011

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT, pursuant to the Washington Rules of Civil Procedure, the Jorgensen Public Meeting was taken before Kathleen McKee, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, #3115, and a Notary Public for the State of Washington, on June 16, 2011 commencing at the hour of 7:01 p.m., the proceedings being reported at 6737 Corson Avenue South, Seattle, Washington.

JORGENSEN PUBLIC MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 16, 2011

7:01 P.M.

MS. TYLER: Welcome to the public meeting for the Jorgensen Forge facility. I'm Kendra Tyler and I'm the community involvement coordinator for the site. And tonight we're going to hear presentations by EPA Ecology and the Duwamish River Coalition to discuss the proposed cleanup options for the forge. We will first hear from Shawn Blocker with EPA over here who will discuss the post cleanup followed by the Department of Ecology, John Keeling, who will talk about a planned cleanup. We'll then have question and answer and then begin the public testimony.

Just a few quick things. If you haven't already figured out the bathrooms are over there to the right. We are videotaping and also a court reporter over here so if you do have questions or plan to give public comment please speak directly into the microphone and state your name as well. If you do not wish -- would not like to come up to the microphone stand and just raise your hand and we'll bring you a hand mic for you to use as well. I think that's about it and we'll go ahead and start with Shawn Blocker's presentation.

MR. BLOCKER: Can everybody hear me? Yes. Does that sound good? Yes, I don't have my Marine voice tonight

so I'm going to have use a microphone. Welcome to everybody. And as Kendra said we're going to discuss the proposed remedy for the Jorgensen Forge facility. Take about ten minutes and then we'll start answering questions.

History of Jorgensen Forge, it was financed by the U.S. Navy in 1942 to manufacture naval ship equipment. It was operated as Isaacson Iron Works from '45 to '65 and then as Earle M. Jorgensen facility from '65 to '92. Since '92 it's been known as Jorgensen Forge. Jorgensen Forge and Boeing Jorgensen are different companies, so just to delineate that. And as such both remained on the order for the site.

The facility, this is a picture of the Duwamish Waterway and where the old river used to go. Jorgensen Forge is located here. So it also is in the stretch of what was the channel the Core put through at around the turn of the century. Here's kind of a schematic of the site. The area we're going to be cleaning up is this section here. Now, unlike the Boeing order the Jorgensen Forge Superfund order is only the top of the slope out towards the sediments. U.S. EPA is not involved with any of the other cleanups. Those are being done under the Department of Ecology. So when I'm talking about our order, the source control, things like that, it is only in relationship to the section that I have authority over.

So Jorgensen proposed four alternatives to Eco. The first alternative, this was no action, doing nothing. The next two are what are called dredge and cap. I'll show a schematic of what those look like is where you're digging out material and in some areas you put a cap over the top for some residual material you leave in. The fourth alternative was full removal and backfill. What I mean full removal, what they're doing is they're digging down to what's called the sediment quality standard, SQS. And then putting what we call clean backfill. It's what is known as RBCs. At Boeing we called it TMCLs. RBCs is basically the same thing. It's just Superfund cleanup. What that means is the material that goes back into the sediments is clean with no PCBs.

So to look at quickly at the alternatives this is kind of the overhead of alternative two. What Jorgensen has done is they broke these different areas down into management units. It makes it easier to design it. Now, something you will see is this is alternative two where you're looking down on it. This is a cross-section. And what you see, this is an area where they were just going to dig stuff out. Here's an area where they were going to dig and build a cap and then an area where they were just going to dig out. This scenario would end up leaving contaminated material in this area here under a permanent cap.

Alternative three was very, very similar. If you looked at the map from the first one to this one you would have seen one difference. This cell here is a different color. That's it. In this scenario you see basically the same cross-section. It looks very similar. There again we're going to leave some contamination, a minor amount, underneath that cap and the cap had to be there forever.

The fourth alternative, this shows a cross-section, and I want to make a note because I'm going to be commented on it tonight so I'll just address it now. This color when you look at the maps it says one foot dredged. It means more than one foot. It means 45 centimeters. So that is the point of compliance for Jorgensen. They will be digging to 45 centimeters. The cross-section when they're done is this. All excavated material, clean backfill here, no cap which means you don't have to worry about long-term maintenance of some structure there and all the contamination is out.

So one thing everybody is concerned about is source control. Okay? If we clean it up is it going to get dirty again. So what we're doing with the source control with Jorgensen is I can only control the sources that are within the boundaries of my site, which include the large four-inch storm drain, the drain at part of Boeing Plant -- or Boeing Field, Jorgensen, Boeing Plant 2, and then three

smaller storm drains. The 24-inch dig line which was a concern because it had some high PCBs in it is gone. They're in the process, it's being closed off. There's still some of it in the ground but it's going to get dug up fairly immediate so that's gone. The other three storm drains Ecology is going to be talking about in their presentation if he gets here in time. Otherwise I'll be talking about his presentation.

Larger source control, one of the other concerns is location. When you've cleaned up your area what do you do about stuff that's coming down the river. We call it the larger source control picture. That's being organized and done by the Washington State Department of Ecology. They call it their Source Control Action Plan. Once we do all the removal and put back the land we'll have a minimum of ten years post-construction monitoring. What that means is every year Jorgensen will go out and take a sample to see if the sediments have become recontaminated. Jorgensen is only liable for that recontamination if we show that it came from their site. That's why we're all (inaudible). So if their sediment is getting recontaminated and they can show us that the groundwater is clean and if their storm water is clean they're not responsible for the damage. It's the same as what we had at Boeing Plant 2.

So what does EPA want? We want cleanup option --

we are recommending cleanup option number four which is the full removal and backfill. The reason we want this is because it gets everything out. The maximum depth that we'll be dredging is about ten feet. We don't have to go nearly as deep as we had to do at Boeing Plant 2. We like this because we don't leave something in place as we maintain in perpetuity. You know, we don't have to worry about fixing those caps some time in the future. Lastly when it comes to the no further action that was not an option but we had to put it in anyway.

So that concludes the Jorgensen portion. I'll answer any questions regarding that if you have them. Or since John Keeling isn't here I'll try to plow through his. Yes, (b) (6)?

MR. (b) (6): The one thing I didn't hear in your plan on this particular site is that it's all in water?

MR. BLOCKER: No, a lot of the work would be done out of water.

MR. (b) (6): Good.

MR. BLOCKER: It doesn't have nearly as much in the water as what we had at Boeing Plant 2.

MR. (b) (6): Thank you.

MR. BLOCKER: Any other questions? Now, one thing I wanted to mention this portion of the meeting when I answer your questions if you want to have your question as

part of the record please wait until we open up the public comment period and then come up and ask that question again, okay? Come up during the public comment section so that it becomes part of the official record if you want to be responded to. So, any other questions? Yes, Ms. (b) (6)?

MS. (b) (6): So, I wasn't invited to the Boeing meeting but I didn't hear about the new dredging proposal so if you could explain the (inaudible).

MS. TYLER: Shawn, before you start can she repeat the question, please?

MS. (b) (6): (b) (6), People for Puget Sound. So if you could explain about the dredge proposal for the site, please.

MR. BLOCKER: You didn't get invited to Boeing?

MS. (b) (6): I didn't.

MR. BLOCKER: Okay. The proposal which will -- okay, the proposal -- I guess I am going to use my Marine voice. The proposal that we had at Boeing is they're going to be using some extended arm excavators that have a specially designed clam at the end that reduces the amount of suspended sediments that are left in the water quality. The presentation that Boeing gave to myself and the Corps of Engineers showed that that had the least impact on the river. And like I said, Boeing has agreed to give that same presentation at the RCC and I'm sure everyone else will show

up to see that technology. Okay? Go ahead.

MS. (b) (6): Can you please just sort of tell us what the special thing is on the end?

MR. BLOCKER: It looks like a normal clam shell. It's got a cover on it that flops back that keeps the stuff from sloshing out. It looks like a clam shell.

MS. (b) (6): Following up on that question we have -- some people have attempted to get this information already and we'll comment on that later but since it's EPA's decision and it's being incorporated into the EE/CA to direct this we would like more detail provided in the final even thought it's still a draft at this point. And if you could explain what evidence or what experience was provided by Boeing as you evaluated that information. We're assuming that there's a fair amount of information available for you to have been persuaded so more of that information, transparent, would help us here tonight very much.

MR. BLOCKER: Sure. I'm not going to try to recreate what I saw other than tell you it was really, really, really, really good. What they showed was the data in comparison to the suspended sediments using soakers in a (inaudible) environment and using (inaudible) and then in comparison with the utilization of the system which you saw as this actually has the least amount of sediments. This (inaudible) only five to seven percent of suspension with

this technology by similar to nine or fifteen or something. And each -- I'm sorry, from four months ago.

MS. TYLER: Anymore questions right now? John, are you here?

MR. BLOCKER: Okay. Now, I'll be playing the part of John Keeling, Washington State Department of Ecology, and hopefully I'll get his presentation correct. This is mainly in regards to what's going on in the uplands. The uplands area as you can see is the area highlighted in yellow where Ecology has the order on. Basically the initial order was to look at what was the contamination they found in the uplands area. They completed that evaluation and determined that there are some areas that need to be addressed in the uplands which means some remediation in minor amounts but also some dealing with the storm drains since they discharge into the Duwamish. The investigation they did showed surface water. They looked at other storm drains. Looked in the actual drains themselves and the suspended sediments and then monitored the outflows, what was coming out. They also have wells that they use to monitor the shoreline to see what is coming out through that area. And then they did a northern boundary soil investigation so that's basically the area that bounds between Boeing Plant 2 and Jorgensen.

What they basically found was that the storm water could cause the Sound to be contaminated. Now, those storm

drains have NPDES discharge permits. And the limits that they're seeing coming out of their storm drains are below those discharge limits. But that's not necessarily the concentrations you need to ensure that the sediments are protected. What Jorgensen has chosen to do is to enter into a new order with Ecology where they will be doing another pipe treatment for the storm water and determine if more work needs to be done so that those upland sources which I can't control will be controlled through the Ecology order. And that's the Department of Ecology. Do we have any questions on that? Okay.

MS. TYLER: All right. Right now we're going to begin the testimony. Again, this is being videotaped so if you could speak into the microphone. I think we have a list actually but before I think Linn Gould who is the technical adviser with the Duwamish River Coalition, she's going to come up and give her testimony. So Linn is going to go ahead and give her presentation and then after the presentation we're going to have time for question and answer. So I will be around afterwards.

MS. GOULD: Can everyone hear me? Okay. So my name is Linn Gould and I'm a technical consultant for DRCC/TAG. And what I want to talk to you tonight is even though or just theoretically discussing Jorgensen Forge there's some really, really important linkages between the

early -- other early action areas between the overall Superfund site and the decision documents that are kind of the next -- next series of documents that are coming down the pike. So if this doesn't feel like it's exactly about Jorgensen Forge I would like to try to talk to you about the linkages. Okay.

So just like we picked -- DRCC basically supports alternative four, all right? So that is -- they have below sediment quality standards and clean -- put in two feet of clean backfill. All right? Now, Jorgensen Forge has acknowledged that some of their -- some of their -- the complete vertical extent of PCBs is not complete and all the (inaudible). They've acknowledged that and they said don't worry, we're going to go down deeper at those issues. Okay.

Next. This was not a very fun document to review for me because it lacks an executive summary. Executive summaries are very important for public review. They provide a general overview of the contents of the EE/CA. They make the EE/CA simpler to review for the public and it really puts the public at a disadvantage for them not to be able to read the executive summary. I have to say that I also went into the source control document and that also lacks an executive summary. Now, Shawn will tell you it doesn't -- it's not required. It's true, executive summaries are not required. But T-117 had one and they

really do help the public understand what is going on.

Okay. Recontamination potential. It is -- it is a real problem that these -- we know that Jorgensen Forge, the uplands probably contaminated the sediments. However there is two separate documents and two separate orders. One is done by the EE/CA and one is done by the Department of Ecology. And there's a lack of -- there's gaps in consistencies because those are two different documents. And one of the things that's really, really hard to understand when you read the EE/CA is what is the recontamination potential that will come from the uplands without also reading the source control document. And the problem with the source control document is that it actually lacks a series of conceptual models that helps you understand how migration pathways, how soils and ground water and surface water, how -- how things from the uplands flow into the sediments. And this isn't just about recontamination potential from Jorgensen Forge. There's also a real potential that things from Boeing during cleanup could contaminate -- recontaminate the sediments.

Next. One of the things that we're really concerned about is how do you sequence cleanups. We've got cleanups in the uplands between Boeing Plant 2, Jorgensen Forge, and T-117. We've got those upland cleanups and then you've got the cleanups happening in the sediments. And

what happens if T-117 cleans up their sediments first and then Jorgensen Forge comes along and cleans up their sediments and recontaminates T-117? So we just want to be really, really clear about how we go about sequencing all this to prevent recontamination. And then just right downriver a little bit we've got the beaches. Okay?

So the dredging. Mechanical dredging has -- we now know or we understand hydraulic dredging really will cause a lot more contamination -- contamination than a certain specific type of mechanical dredging. And that's fine as long as the performance standards are achieved and that we have best management practices. But basically the public deserves a very, very thorough look at whatever design is occurring around dredging. And we welcome the fact that DRCC -- excuse me, that Boeing and Jorgensen Forge are willing to give us at DRCC and the public -- a presentation on dredging.

Next. Recontamination potential. We are still concerned about upriver source control. And we hope that that will be focused on in the future.

Next. Final sediment cleanup levels. When Shawn talks about cleaning up the sediment cleanup standards, specifically for PCBs, those are sediment cleanup standards. They are not cleaning up to the sediment plan standards that are protective of human health if you are -- if you are a

tribal fisherman eating as much as we've calculated that some communities fish from the river. Okay? So the DRCC is advocating for better cleanup levels that are more protected than this -- than these cleanup standards. It doesn't change the fact that we don't accept alternative four. Okay?

Finally, institutional controls. Institutional controls in the EE/CA are basically just saying, oh, you know, we're going to maybe do some fish advisories. That's not enough. We know, we have proof that fish advisories do not help environmental justice communities. We need to have culturally competent institutional controls. Some examples are, and these need to be reflected in all the decision documents, some examples are that we've seen in other fishing communities are education about fishing contamination. How to prepare and cook contaminated fish. Receive maps of alternative fishing locations. Culturally competent campaigns to raise awareness. Transportation, free transportation services to other places where they can fish. Vouchers to buy seafood at markets. And job creation for community outreach experts. So Duwamish has a vision of cleaning up the river. I've made eight points which are right here in front of you and that's it. Thank you.

MS. TYLER: Thank you, Linn. We'll open it up for questions. Do you have any questions for Linn? Okay. Rene, I think you have the list for people who want to speak.

MS. DAGSETH: I do. The first person is (b) (6) (b) (6) s.

MS. TYLER: (b) (6) is going to provide testimony.

MR. (b) (6) : My name is (b) (6) and I live on South Park near the (inaudible) site. And we're worried about (inaudible) that you've proposed that mostly will be loaded on a barge and transported to other sites. Given the high winds and the chance of recontamination airborne at our particular location we're wondering what measures will be available immediately. First question. The second one is that we were -- and it is going to be a barge and then water dredging. Will there be notice to the mariners because this is a major waterway and major boat traffic both recreational and commercial. That's my comments for this particular point except for the fact that it (inaudible).

MS. DAGSETH: The next speaker is (b) (6)

MS. (b) (6) : So I'm (b) (6) with People for Puget Sound. And again, I would like to reiterate the support for alternative four and getting the sediment out, the contaminated sediment out of the river. This is what People for Puget Sound advocates for all the sites around Puget Sound and it's great to hear that's what's going to be happening here. I would like to reiterate also Linn's concern articulated about the sequencing. We didn't really

discuss that so hopefully at some point that will become very clear to us, the community, exactly how this will be sequenced. It's great that these three sites are getting going. So that's great news but could possibly be one. And I'm sorry John's not here so if you could please submit these comments to John.

The concern -- this is a unique site in that we have an industrial site that is being cleaned up with that exact same industry in place. Most of the other sites we're dealing with have had -- you know, it has destroyed the site, the activities that have caused the contamination at hand. But here we have actually have one ongoing. I'm glad that the issue of air was raised because I haven't heard that issue in terms of source control but I'd like to, in the new agreement, have air specifically addressed in terms of pollutants impacting the river and also the site and the storm water runoff from that site as well as the issue of the metals from right off that site. Potentially we could be spending, you know, millions of dollars to clean up. So I hope to see the source control presentation very soon by Ecology. And also to see that presentation I think you -- the one on the dredging I think should be presented back to us here or somewhere else. So it's not just for the DRCC but it's for the entire community. Thanks.

MS. DAGSETH: The next speaker is (b) (6) .

MS. (b) (6) : My name is (b) (6), community environmental services and policy adviser to Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition and Duwamish River advocate in general. I've been working on the Duwamish River for 16 years I think it is now. And have been involved with many of the cleanup sites and decisions that have been made over the past ten years since the river was listed as a Superfund site in 2001. This is overall a very good cleanup plan. The alternative that EPA is proposing, alternative four, is the best alternative but there are some details, and you've been hearing a little bit about it, that we really do need to address and they really are important. So being supportive of alternative four and endorsing the overall goal and approach that EPA is taking is very positive but there's a few things we need to think about and you've heard a little bit about that.

One is insufficient information is provided in this document. It's called the EE/CA for short but this particular cleanup plan, we need the information on the dredging technology determination, what dredging technology is being selected, why is it being selected, what evidence supports its selection. We need that in this document, not in some future design document that does not go through any public review. So right now we're looking at a draft document and we're hopeful and expecting that in the final

we will see some of the information that's currently missing. We hopefully -- what we would have preferred is that everybody could hear about the dredging technology that's being proposed and get comfortable with it.

So I do want to mention for folks who maybe are newer to the river cleanup the first cleanup site was a horrible, awful mess during cleanup and that's why this is so important. So that's something that we really need to see in the final with public involvement and review. The second is the coordination plan as you've been hearing is really important. We've got a lot of things going on on the river all at the same time period. It may not change the cleanup plan but when, where, and how the cleanup gets done might be affected by a coordination with these other sites. Again, we understand that that -- those considerations are being taken into affect but it's not transparent and it's something that should get more discussion in this document at this time.

Prevention of recontamination. Prevention of recontamination is much more important than worrying about assigning liability after the fact. That's not what we want to worry about. We want to make sure it doesn't happen in the first place. So understanding how that's all going to sequence is very important.

And then finally the driving consideration in all

of the decisions that get made have to be about human health, especially in the communities that we're dealing with. These are environmental justice communities. If you're talking about the potential for contaminated sediment to wash up on beaches nearby we're talking about very low-income neighborhoods, very ethnically diverse neighborhoods. A lot of language barriers. We need to make sure that every decision they we're making is really thinking about getting help in the communities that we're dealing with whether they're fishing communities or local resident communities. Thank you, Rene.

And one of the more -- most important pieces of this in addition to how the dredging itself gets done is what Linn mentioned is the institutional controls, a very bureaucratic term for making sure that folks that are fishing in the river and using the river today will have the shortest possible disruption in those activities. And that ultimately those activities will be able to be restored.

So if you count on the river to fish, either because you need it to eat or because it's a very important cultural activity in your community what are we going to do in the interim, right now, and during cleanup so before cleanup to substitute, to provide some reasonable alternatives. And then we also need to make sure it's not a permanent state of affairs that ultimately the decisions

that we make and that ultimately we'll be able to fish in the river again, at least to the extent that we can anywhere in Puget Sound. So those are all the comments. Thank you. Thank you, Shawn.

MS. TYLER: I think for the rest of the comments we're going to have you come up to the front and use the microphone.

MS. DAGSETH: Our next speaker is (b) (6). If anybody else wants to give comments tonight please sign up on the sheet in the back there. Thank you.

MR. (b) (6): Good evening. My name is (b) (6) (b) (6). I am the coordinator for the Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition. You're going to hear me echo what (b) has said in a lot of ways, hopefully saying it in another way that will bring that point home. The Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition, this is a technical assistance group. We work with EPA on outreach. That is what we are supposed to do is to try to make sure that these cleanups are something that you can understand, that you understand is important for the community to be part of. This is stuff that's happening to you. You need to comment on these things. It is very important. If you asked a question or thought about something make that comment because this is the time that it's done. And this is when EPA has to pay attention to it.

My comments are going to start again when this

cleanup needs to be protective of the health of the people that live around and use this river and protect the fish and wildlife of this river. When we talk about SQS levels that is not being protective of those things. We have to make sure that we have a plan, an overall plan that at some point in the future that people are going to be able to eat fish out of this river once again.

It is not good enough to say that it's in a ruined area and that's just the way it is. We know better and we can do better. These are environmental justice communities which means that they have a lot of things piled on top of them. And the health of their -- these communities, Georgetown and South Park, around this river and around these sites. We already know that people that live here are under stress and under strain and have different health problems. We're working on trying to define those health problems so we that can understand them even better and do a better job of recommending -- or representing our communities.

Monitoring before, during, and after dredging. So if the turbidity or any of the bad stuff in the soil gets out into the river then we have to be able to have it shut down as quickly as possible to figure out how we're going to do that. Monitoring on this part has to be done and err on the side of being conservative, not on the side of well,

can't we just get away with it for another half-hour or something before we're going to shut down. It has to be very conservative. So the plans that we're looking at as far as the monitoring of the dredging have to be done and done very conservatively so we don't have a problem that continues like we did on the early -- some of the earlier cleanups that we had.

Recontamination from storm water from Jorgensen Forge is of a high concern. Whatever the agreed-upon order from Ecology will have to give the community a high confidence that this site will no longer contribute to the pollution of the river. Upstream contamination and lateral sources of contamination will recontaminate this site. We need the coordination to happen between EPA and Ecology so that as we go down this road on the full river cleanup we can actually get to the point where we know the contamination that is coming from our upper sources and from our lateral sources will be controlled. Right now they are not. Spending money this way is not a smart thing to do.

We need to find the depth of the contamination in the sediments. We have not found where the bottom is on some of the sediments that are looked at here. So we need to find what depth they are and how far they go down because that's going to be important much later on and as far as how we know how much this is contaminated.

Coordination with all the early action areas need to be clear and well thought out. And that's something that needs to also be communicated to the communities, the people that care about these things. We need to make sure that these things are coordinated as well as with Ecology's source control plan. This is only one piece of the large puzzle. It's not a stand-alone cleanup and a lot of times every time we look at these cleanups we look at it as its own thing and that's all it is. We need to consider all these cleanups and look at them together as one piece of a larger puzzle.

Background on the decision we -- the community and the DRCC, we will be going through this and we'll figure out a way to make sure that it gets out to the public. But the decision on what dredge is going to be used. The background that you have used which hasn't been enumerated in the plans yet really needs to be enumerated so that everybody can understand it and have the confidence that Shawn seems to have in this. But you know "I don't remember" isn't a good enough answer to that. We need to have the documentation why it's going to be so much better.

I want to finish up my comments by saying as I said at the Boeing Plant 2 I am very happy to have Shawn as the person that's on this site. Shawn has done an incredible job on making sure that it's being done and being

done in the right way and that's very important to us. We are people that have learned to look through the details and to comb through that and try to find something. If we don't find something then there's something wrong and there's nothing wrong because we found some things and that's okay.

But I would like to publicly thank Shawn and also the other people that have worked on this cleanup. I would like to also thank Jorgensen Forge for making this evening a nice evening with food for people and that type of thing which does not happen all the time and it's something I think that we need to keep following up on. Even for us that have to work during the day and come here it's nice to have a bite to eat when you're here. So with that thank you for the people that have shown up tonight from the Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition because that's what we do. The other part of it is if you haven't signed up on our ledger out front please do because we can get you more information on what's happening down the road. And other things that are going on on the river. That's what we're supposed to do. Thank you again.

MS. TYLER: All right. Unless anyone else would like to give public testimony I think we are done with that part of the evening. We are scheduled to be here until nine o'clock so I think we'll proceed now with more of the open house. There's more cookies and sandwiches in the back so

feel free. Also the representatives of Jorgensen Forge will still be in the room if you have any additional questions. So thank you for coming tonight. Shawn, do you have anything to say?

MR. BLOCKER: No.

MS. TYLER: All right. I am now going to officially close the comment period.

MR. BLOCKER: I'd like to be able to respond to all your comments and I will do that at the right time. But I want to be able to answer a few questions that are up for discussion so that when you leave tonight you have the answers and aren't waiting. One of the things that was asked was we don't know what we're doing. We don't understand the excavation technology that's being used and we're afraid we're not going to have an opportunity to comment. The process is improvising. This is one proposal of the entire process. I will respond to his comments. (Inaudible.) Jorgensen will prepare a plan. That plan will go out for stakeholder review. There will be another hearing where everybody gets a chance to see what's going on.

This isn't a done deal. It's one phase and then we'll tell Jorgensen go do your thing. There is another round where you can be involved with the process.

Oh, yeah. (Inaudible) to the site, that's the

other one. Myself, there are two project managers for the three sites. Myself, myself and Piper Peterson. Piper Peterson sits in the cube that's right behind me. We are attached at the hip. Almost everything that we're talking about is coordination and I've already spoken with Jorgensen tonight about this coordination and how we will sequence how we're doing this and exactly where we're going to go. Let's not make a mess, let's not trip over each other. Let's only do this once. It is the number one priority of EPA is to make sure that we do this right and coordinated.

(b) (6), you brought up a thing about the air. The air monitoring and things. (Inaudible) usually here at the site. So those are my responses to the questions and we will keep that in mind. So I think those are some main issues that came up that I wanted to address before you guys walked out of here. Anymore questions?

MS. (b) (6): So one-stop shopping is very important for the public so you don't have to try to figure out what documents exist and then find them all.

MR. BLOCKER: Yes.

MS. (b) (6) Can we get a commitment that this will all be, you know, in the final, the final EE/CA? At minimum there is a lot of information that isn't fully detailed in EE/CA. Why not?

MR. BLOCKER: Because I haven't studied EE/CA.

(Inaudible.)

MS. (b)(6) : So for the record.

MR. BLOCKER: For the record. I think that's a great thing. I will respond to comments. Any other questions?

MR. (b)(6) : This is (inaudible) Department of Ecology. And in the final part you're not really discussing it (inaudible) and the restoration agreement. Where was that (inaudible)?

MR. BLOCKER: EPA doesn't (inaudible).

MR. (b)(6) : No.

MR. BLOCKER: Right, right. Whatever restoration agreements between Jorgensen. And I guess I was addressing the physical contamination. So by coordinating the statements with them hopefully Jorgensen will say oh, by the way, do you guys want to (inaudible). It significantly affected what their design was. So to answer your question there's not a whole lot.

MR. (b)(6) The thing I'm rather curious about is from the community's pont of view, the end result (inaudible) process. At this particular stage in the process other than (inaudible).

MR. BLOCKER: Right. And of course in that respect that means it just is, period. Thank you everybody.

(Whereupon the public meeting was concluded at 7:46 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Kathleen M. McKee, do hereby certify that pursuant to the Rules of Civil Procedure, the witness named herein appeared before me at the time and place set forth in the caption herein; that at the said time and place, I reported in stenotype all testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing matter; and that the foregoing transcript pages constitute a full, true and correct record of such testimony adduced and oral had and of the whole thereof.

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 22nd day of June, 2011.

/Signed ___ December 9, 2012

Kathleen M. McKee Commission Expiration

E